

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 VEM YENOVKIAN,

4 Plaintiff

5 v.

6 PETAL CARD, INC.,

7 Defendant

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00026-APG-MDC

**Order Accepting Report and
Recommendation and Dismissing Case**

[ECF No. 21]

8 On December 16, 2024, Magistrate Judge Couvillier recommended that I dismiss this
9 case without prejudice because plaintiff Vem Yenovkian did not provide proof of service by the
10 given deadline. ECF No. 21. Yenovkian did not object. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct a de
11 novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts
12 to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings
13 to which objection is made”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)
14 (en banc) (“the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations
15 de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)).

16 I THEREFORE ORDER that Magistrate Judge Couvillier’s report and recommendation
17 **(ECF No. 21) is accepted** and plaintiff Vem Yenovkian’s complaint **(ECF No. 11) is dismissed**
18 **without prejudice** for failure to timely serve the defendant. The clerk of court is instructed to
19 close this case.

20 DATED this 7th day of January, 2025.

21 
22 _____
23 ANDREW P. GORDON
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE